

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1860.

No. 33

The Principia

PROSPECTUS

THE AMERICAN OLIGARCHY—WHEREIN LIES ITS STRENGTH 1

NUMBER FIFTEEN

SLAVEHOLDERS CONTROL THE NATION, BECAUSE THE NATION, BY PERMITTING THEM TO BE SLAVEHOLDERS, EXEMPTS FROM THE CONTROL OF LAW, AND THIS ELEVATES THEM ABOVE THE GOVERNMENT

We reach, at length, the last link in the chain of our argument, proving that the controlling power of the slaveholders, lies simply, in the tolerated existence of slaveholding.

out the statement that he is one who is not under the *protection* of law, so the definition of the word "placeholder," is incomplete, without the statement that he is one who is not under the *controlling restraint* of law.

The latter fact is involved in the former one. If, as the Slave Code says, "The slave is one who is in the power of a master, to whom he belongs," then, of course, the slave-holder is one who has the control of the slave whom he owns. And the control of the master, allowed by the community, is as absolute and unlimited as is the dependence and submission to which the slave is allowed by the community.

Whoever studies the American Slave Code in its enactments, its judicial decisions, the execution of these decisions with the illustrative facts of daily life in the Slave States, will learn that the submissiveness of the slave is unbroken, the power of the master absolute. This is the very atmosphere of the code, made by slaveholders, as the founders of

July 1941. *North Carolina Institute of Science*.

The power of the material of the anode, to render one or more of the gases present, will not be less than the weight of the anode.

the right of the author to receive payment for his original work in
any form of publication. The author, RICHARD COVE, the
several books which is not available from his publisher, 12 D-
aux S. Caron, Béziers. See State Code p. 12.

He is a man that is popular in his region - his class - above the usual - of course - and at the same time

land or free. Though this is an abomination, yet in the United States it is practised openly in the prevailing practice. And, as a statement of such practice, it is strictly and literally true, so far as the relations of slaveholders and slaves are concerned. Hence the proverbial lawlessness of slaveholding communities is the bane of which a cast is cast, that is elevated into a defiance of law. Hence also it is that the plow of the mullet, the dirk of the assassin, the bludgeon and bowie knife of the ruffian, instead of the militia, the magistrate, and the constable, become the controlling forces of Southern society, and overrule the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. The boasted chivalry of the South, is simply its defiant superiority to law.

It may be objected that there are statutes in Slave States for punishing those who murder and maim slaves. But, on close inspection, it will commonly be found, that the statutes have in view the protection of *slave property*, like the protection of other property, rather than the personal protection of the slave, himself, as a man. And when the statute seems to go beyond this, and to contemplate the protection of the slave himself, it will be found to be illusive, because to slave and no colored person can testify against a white man, and no slave can sue in the Courts. All such seemingly protective statutes are a dead letter, of no practical benefit to the slave.

The last words, and so on, it does not prevent or prohibit the holding of **four millions** of its inhabitants, ("villens," as Jefferson called them), in this condition of object submissio[n] to lawless and uncontrolled men. Neither the Nation, nor the States wherein the slaves are held, provide for them any *protecting law*. This is practically saying to the slaveholders, whenever few or many "Gentlemen and ladies, drivers and overseers, assigns and slave-ladies, sons and daughters of slaveholders"! In respect to these four millions of the American people, you are under no controlling restraint of law! We have indeed laws, but they are

"not to restrain or control you, in these relations. We have the writ of habeas *c*oris, we have grand-juries, petit-juries, and Courts of law, but they are not for the benefit of your slaves. You may do to them whatever you please, and our laws shall afford to them no protection. We have indeed, a Government, ordained by the people of the United States, to establish justice, and insure the blessings of liberty. We may assist in the administration of that Government at a great expense, but it is not a govern-

By using some of the above methods, the following results were obtained:

and removes a slave after the主人 of the slave has done this, is a law, impartially administered, and exists. All the Government has to do in order to abolish slavery is to enact righteous laws, and administer them well. It is only by the neglect of the Government, for the protection of slaves, that they are now administered, for the protection of all other persons. In the same way, in order to abolish slavery, it is only necessary to pass a law, such as the SLAVE-LAW, that shall be controlled by them, privately as all other men are controlled. This is the abolition of slavery, and the whole of it. So that all the noise made, and all the money raised, in this country against the abolition of slavery, whether by the State, or National Government, is nothing more than less opposition to the abolition of the estate of slave-holders, as an order of nobility, superior to other men, whose distinctive privilege it is to be exempt from the administration of the laws, and above their word. The whole anti-slavery controversy is comprised in this suggestion.

The most radical abolitionist propounds nothing better than this, that slaveholders, like all others, shall be under the same control of equal laws, that other men are. And all the law and cry that is raised about invading the rights of the slave-holders, and the State rights of slaveholders, is simply a bull and a cripple against all the slaveholders no more right to be exempt from the control of equal laws, than the rest of the community have.

Now, it is evident that the toleration, in any State or nation, of such an order or caste of men, is, of itself, the elevation of them above the laws, and consequently above the Government by whom laws are administered.

The central of such a body of men over the State and nation that thus elevated them above law and Government, is too evident to require proof. Such control is inevitable in the very nature of the case. And the control becomes confirmed and intensified, if possible, when, in addition to this release from all law, the lawless brigands are themselves elevated to the position of legislators, judges, and executives over all people claiming to be free. The infatuation and the sottishness of submitting to this, exceed anything else that the page of history records. How any intelligent and reflecting man can imagine that they can tolerate such an order of lawless *idiots*, and permit them to be their law-makers, and yet not be under the control of them, as their *apron rags* is something we have never yet been able to understand. The past and passing history of the country supplies ample illustrations in point. The lawless *caravans* of the plantations, of the kitchen and of the slave quarter has become the lawless control of the whole country. The lords of the slave, have become the lords of the slaves of both the South and the North. Lawless in their relations to their slaves, they become lawless in their relations to all other men. How should any lawless *conquerors* or *conquistadors* treat those who are not bound by the laws of equity and justice and men that hold office in this land? How should they regard the *southern* *conquerors*, who are managing here a quarter of a continent of men, using the eyes of four millions of them as slaves to their *apron rags*? What are we to do? What is to be done? What is to be done? What are we *Mississippians*? What are we *Confederates*? What are we *Statesmen*? What is *West*? Is *West* a popular name or a geographical Territory? Is *West* the only independent *territory* existing today, nothing else? Presently the *East* and *West* will be nothing but *apron rags* or *slaves* to the *Confederates* or *Confederacy*. The *Confederacy* is a *slave* *territory*. So far as *Confederates* were slaves and *rebel*. Each *Confederate* born, we have seen, by Southern dictation upon the *North*, we

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER 31

and by the same legislation annulled, prominently using a threat of disunion. The demand of 1850 is the reversal of the demand for popular sovereignty of 1850. Nullification is slavery—“State rights”—by Northern freemen it is treason—“Popular sovereignty” for Kansas and “National popular sovereignty” meant the carrying of slavery into Kansas by the northern states.

All this, and the like of it, is but the necessary result of the naturalization of a caste of shareholders released by that *ius sollemnis* from the controlling restraints of law, and who are all government and no man, and that enforcement of law is the responsibility of *herself*, and *herself* is a slave.

Before bringing this discussion to a close, we must mention one other point. A respondent has suggested to us

It was the origin of slavery, to the right of slavery, and its gradual support. It did no harm to us in the South, and necessarily those who have been most actively opposed to constitute the main strength of slaves in the country. We admit that slavery might grow out of land monopoly, and we have no doubt that it sometimes has originated in that way. But we have no evidence that this was the origin of slavery in this country. Land monopoly has been claimed, and still exists, in the North and Northwest, and is great evil, but its victims are not subjected to chattel slavery. No doubt it would abolish slavery at the South, because the slaves are a racial, not a class, and not a property, and the slaves are not the property of the master.

Souls to make the slaves proprietors of land. And so it would, to give them access to the ballot box, or to concede to them the rights of marriage, and the family relation, or the right to claim wages. This is only saying that the abolition of slavery would abolish it! We see no force in this objection against the doctrine we have maintained. Land monopoly is *in itself* a slavery, and in even more comprehensive. But we are speaking distinctly of the "American Oligarchy," of slaveholders, as we find it. The slaveholders monopolize land *in consequence* of being slaveholders, and of denying the right of the slaves to hold property, by holding *them* as property. And besides: we are promised to show, not the *origin* of slavery, but the seat of the controlling power of a slaveholding Oligarchy that already exists.

Our correspondent also objects, that in America, that notwithstanding what we have said, there is no established caste. We know not why this is alleged, unless it be, because the constitutions of the nation and of the states do not establish any caste. We know not whether the castes of India repose on any written constitutions for their basis. It is the *fact* of caste that we have to do with, not the particular form in which it exists, or the written documents on which it reposes. And we have shown that if there be caste in India, there is caste also in the United States.

We have now brought our argument to a close. We claim to have proved what we proposed: namely, that the strength of the slaveholding oligarchy, lies solely in the fact of its tolerated existence.

The practical inferences to be derived from the discussion, our readers will consider for themselves. In some form we hope to advert to the matter in our columns before long. But the whole may be comprised in a nut-shell, and has frequently been anticipated by us, already, in the course of our discussions. It is this

Since the *controlling power of the slaveholding oligarchy lies solely in its theoretical existence, the only practicable way of escape from its control, is by a national determination to tolerate its existence no longer.* Until this determination shall have been made, there can be no national escape, nor prospect of safety from the control of the slaveholders, who, upon this, as in their **SLAVERY.** IN THE SIMPLE FACT OF SLAVERY HOLDING.

James Jackson, the anti-slavery lawyer of Cincinnati, has just received a letter from North Carolina, where he has been presenting the claim of an ex-convict as slave-woman and her six children as an estate sale at \$10,000.00, to be held in trust and later for his husband Eric, son of the husband, Mr. Eli ab Willis, emigrated to New Zealand, where it is intended to settle and live on the land. His wife, Mrs. Jackson, died dropped dead on the 10th. His son, Mr. Eric, is now in New Zealand, seeking to accumulate enough to buy his wife's will. But Mr. Jackson has presented the case and has finally emerged

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.
NUMBER VI.

ever man exists. It is an Emily for the State. That is an ability. Every writing which Governmental power is subject to this right. Moreover the description of this right is not only moral, and therefore the right is not only moral, but it is a compact. No community can exist in its own name but it agrees to suppression of wrongs. Every man is bound by the golden rule to set his own obligation of other men's rights, and no obligation is moral as well as individual. A due consideration of these plain truths will always recommend a favorable sense of the Constitution. This discussion is not from any religious viewpoint in this case, but from the mere reach when the law is. You would look to the Constitution to know whether you have a right to the fruits of your own labor, or what you have a right to, or the enjoyment of. Your wife and child from would be of no use, if it did not recognize a law of justice higher than itself, and hold the guardianship of rights-independent of itself. First ascertain from natural justice what rights are, and then consult the Constitution for the method securing them.

But politicians have used the Constitution, if not indeed creating rights, yet as something above them, or as having power to annul them, by creating obligations against them. As accustomed to constitutional forms and habituated to talk of constitutional rights, they forgot that rights were for the Constitution, and that judgment has the right of natural justice for its end. Regarding this very language as not showing its true meaning, they go at it to find its meaning, or rather to find a place for substituting a different one. From the known fact that slaveholding was shared in framing the Constitution, and from the impossibility of their having such a measure of moral rectitude and honesty, as really to intend what they made the instrument say, it has been regarded as not the liberty document at all, but something which slaveholders can approve, referring to Lyander Spooner's unanswerable argument of the unconstitutionality of slavery, the *New-York Tribune*, in a late editorial, said: "We can only break the ice of Mr. Spooner's propositions by arguing that we know (outside of the Constitution) that slaves were in bad slaveholding, and that they *cannot have* instead, their plain and comprehensive provisions for securing the liberty of all some, innocent men and women, to have provided for the liberation of their own slaves." — *Semimonthly Tribune*, June 5, 1860.

The argument assumes either that the great mass of the people who were non-shareholders, came into the views of shareholders, and ratified what they intended and not the justitudo as it was written; or else that, if the people generally acted with more truth and honesty and resolution to ratify the writing, that fact is not to be regarded. Such is the reasoning used to make the Constitution an instrument of falsehood! When slaveholders complain that they wish to secure the blessings of liberty, they are to be presumed dishonest, and their intentions not to *work*, must be suspected! Such is the privilege of *absolute* and *tyrannical* *against* *truth* and *right*! Not the *university* of right, but the *college* *lower* has been in the *charge* in ministering the Constitution. Men took up arms as *defenders* *of* *the* *nation* *as* *it* *was* *constituted*—*defending* *nothing* *but* *a* *principle* *of* *justice* *and* *principles* *of* *liberty* *had* *made* *possible* *a* *uniting* *and* *aided* *us* *in* *discharging* *an* *obligation* *of* *moral* *consciousness*! A wonder for *figures*!

All this has resulted from not remembering that right is
more, that the obligations of society are founded on
the sense of right, and that the law is as far from origi-
nating in the public mind as it is from the instrument of
carrying it into effect.

But we will be the ones who hold the children & make them be. Now we are different. It is our duty to do this. But that is not what we want. The Church must work to save the world. Wait for the coming of the Kingdom. God's Word must come. That is the duty of the Church. And we must work to make sure we can do this without sin. It should be a priority that we will not work both ways. When there comes a judgment of the world, we will be held responsible for our sins. If we are not prepared for it, we will be lost. In the sake of their light, let us be like them. Let us count it as a blessing, who should not be in our Jewishness it.

LETTER FROM ALICE

BRYAN, O. June 3, 1863.
FRIEND GOODELL.—I have thought for some days past that I would drop you a line, by way of encouragement, for I have, from practical experience, how consulting it is to have a word of encouragement in our "up-hill" labors.

I am truly glad that we have at least one man in the United States who has the nerve, and the honesty to advocate the truth and the right. *The Principle*¹² is truly a welcome visitor¹³ to me, and never before, so much so, as in the Republican Convention at Chicago. When that party trailed its colors (if it had any,) in the dust, by the combination of a man who has ignored every principle of anti-slavery, in his public speeches, and adopted a platform that is more than conservative, it placed itself on a plane entirely too low for Free Soil or Abolitionists. When I left the Democratic party, I united with the Free Soil party—a party that asked a repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act, and opposed the admission of slave States, and I cannot now so far lose sight of principle, as to co-operate with a party that clearly ignores all these doctrines. *I will not*

The question may be very properly asked, how can Free-soilers and Abolitionists vote for such a candidate on such a platform? I am satisfied that thousands who, claim to be the one or the other, will be found to be neither. If it can be done, and consistently maintained, I do not know how it will be done. The record of Mr. Lincoln is, in my mind, bad. He ignores the principles of humanity in the colored race, both free and slave; and as abolitionists claim the right to freedom of the one class, and political equality to the other, how can they be consistent, to say nothing of honesty, in supposing such a man? If the principles we advocate are worth anything, they are worth being honest for; and if we are not honest enough to carry our principles to the ballot-box, the only place they can be made effectual, they are of no value.

little avail in such hands. If Republicans see paper to
levigate such men, let them test upon them, without the
aid of abolition writers.

BURTING ALIVE.—The *Chicago Republic* says Sunday, July 1st, a child in that place died, was separated from the body and on the following Monday preparations were made for a burial. In the afternoon of that day the body, which had been buried, was discovered buried and on the grave.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1817. VOL. I. NO. 1.

THE COMPROMISES OF THE CONSTITUTION.

A Correspondent writes us—

"Please give us in the *Principia*, some of your strong arguments showing that the apportionment and taxation clauses in the constitution do not recognize slaves.—Our leading idea is that the slaves of the Democratic party will show that the Declaration of Independence does not mean the negro, and of course the Republicans have no right to meet it. The consequence is, we are losing a thorough discussion of the slaves' question."

OUR ANSWER.

The *Principia* will be happy to furnish its Republican readers with arguments wherewith to meet proslavery Democrats, if they find their Republican papers do not furnish them any that are strong enough.—Their "Democratic" opponents evidently understand the necessity of getting to the root of the controversy. They understand that if the Declaration of Independence does mean to include the negro, then the apportionment and taxation clauses of the Constitution cannot recognize negroes as slaves. All the Republicans have to do, therefore, "to meet" the Democrats is to hold them to the "self-evident" fact that the Declaration of Independence, *does* recognize and declare the equal and inalienable right of *all men* to liberty, and that "*all men*" include *black men*, unless the Democrats can prove that *black men are not men!* *Is the negro a man?* Settle that question with your Democratic opponents, and you settle the whole.

But then, if you undertake "to meet" them on that point, you must stick to it, and not admit that the Declaration of Independence of the thirteen United Colonies, while it recognized the negroes as *men*, in some of the States, recognized them as *slaves*, *chattels*, *cattle*, *in other states!* The Democrats will easily trip up your hooks, if they catch you stumbling in that manner, on legs that are unequal.

But perhaps you want to know what to do with the language of the Constitution, in the "apportionment and taxation clauses"—as it reads.

Do with it? Why! Let it mean precisely what it says, and do not allow the pro-slavery Democrats to twist it into any thing else. Constrain the clauses according to the legal rules of construction, and don't allow the Democrats to constrain them otherwise.

THE APPORTIONMENT CLAUSE.

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of *free persons*, in each State, so as to receive for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all *other persons*." Art. I Sect. 2 Clause 3.

This provision speaks only of "*persons*." Human beings are the only "*persons*" in the United States. *Chattels*, *real estate*, houses, oxen, sheep and pigs are not "*persons*." But this elementary truth is the *halo* of the thick-skinned "*Democrats*,"—as we make them feel what company such "*persons*" as themselves are herding themselves with and who they are, if my body, that may be *held* as *battoe*!

If, as your pro-slavery Democrats say the Declaration of Independence does not recognize negroes as *men*, (when they say "*all men* are created equal") then it does not recognize them as "*persons*." And then, too, the *Constitution* does not recognize them as "*persons*." And if it does not recognize them as "*persons*" then this clause of the Constitution says nothing at all about them, and consequently does not "recognize them as slaves." So that in our construction of the Declaration agrees now them, at this point. Make that *set* *that*.

But the truth is this clause, as it speaks a "*persons*," does *not* agree, along with a "*persons*." And, speaking of them as "*persons*" it does not agree with them. For *persons* as *such* do not agree with them—*and property* or *manacles* cannot be "*persons*."

"But why?" it may be asked, was the term "free" introduced, as distinguishing *some* *persons* from *all other persons*?

We answer the word "free" in its legal technical sense, as used in books of law, and in Constitution and charters, at that time and previously, in this country and in England, did not mean *free*, as is distinction from *slaves*, but as signifying those who have the franchises of "free subjects"—"free citizens"—"freemen" in distinction from *slaves*. So then the phrase "all other persons" in this clause, means *slaves* and *not slaves*—See Magna Charta, the Charter of Rhode Island, the Constitutions of Georgia, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, Maryland, Delaware and New York, also the Articles of Confederation and later Constitutions of Pennsylvania and Connecticut, in all of which the word "free"—"free citizens," "free inhabitants" or "freemen" are thus used. Town meetings of citizens in Connecticut are called "freemen's meetings," but men who are *not* *citizens* are *not* *slaves*. See also *Judges* *Plan*, *1804*, &c. &c.

The legal rules of interpretation require us to construe the Constitution in this sense. The word "free" is a *legal word*, in the service of law. And the rule is—

When technical words are used, they are to be understood in their technical sense and meaning, unless the contrary plainly appears." 9. Pickering 514. See also 1 Blackstone, 22, and 1 Kent, 461.

On any question where the claims of slavery were not so favored, the courts would rightly conform to this rule; But they overthrow all rules, when necessary to maintain slavery.

Another reason why neither this nor any other clause of the Constitution can recognize slavery is, that neither at the time when the Constitution was formed, nor before or afterwards, has there ever been any positive law or legislative enactments legalizing slavery in any of the Colonies or States comprised in this Union. So that *there never has been any legal slavery to be "recognized" by the Constitution*.—It could not "recognize" what did not exist. And, in law, slavery did not and does not exist. On this point of the entire absence of any law for slavery, we might quote if we had room, John J. Calhoun, Senator Mason, Judges Matthews and Poirier, Senators Douglas and Toombs, Gen. Stringfellow, and perhaps half the Southern Representatives in Congress. But if all this does not satisfy nor silence your pro-slavery Democrats, let them have it all their own way, if they will, and then, at your leisure, you can show them how much they have gained by it. Just see here!

If this apportionment clause *does* apply to slaves, if it does include "three fifths" of them in the apportionment of Representatives, if it *does* thus dignify the negroes of the Slave States, bond and free, into a constituency represented by "Representatives in Congress" that *then* *emancipates them*, of course for by that construction, the House of Representatives, "represent" the "persons" held as slaves! The constituents of Members of Congress, are entitled to the protection of their "representatives" in Congress, as citizens, and not one of them can be legally enslaved. Congress is bound to secure their freedom. From this dilemma there is no possible escape. So thoroughly had chief Justice Taney and the judges of the Supreme Court been convinced of this by a radical abolition pamphlet sent to each of them, a few months before the Dred Scott decision, that the "apportionment clause" was studiously ignored by those of them who decided that a negro could not be a citizen. That clause did not choose to mention, well knowing that it could be wielded against them, and so they cited only the "rendition clause" and the "migration and importation clause," which latter has been extant since 1808. It is high time for pro-slavery Democrats, who go for the Dred Scott decision, to show the example of their own identical *justice* Taney, and proudly let the "apportionment clause" alone!

THE ELIMINATION CLAUSE.

"No person held as a slave in any one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another State, in consequence of any law or regulation thereto, so as to be lawfully held as a slave in the said State, will be apprehended, restrained, or removed, or compelled to return into such State, to such person or persons as before held or had him in his or her service or labor, except by a law made in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States, and then only for a period not exceeding six months, and then only to be delivered up, on claim of the party holding such service or labor, may be done." Art. IV Sect. 2 Clause 3.

* In *Spence's* *Annotations on the Constitution*, these words are reiterated at length. No one doubts that the difference in law between a man and a dog, and even between a *slat* and a *negro*, is that the *slat* is *not* *free*, and that any man, *for* *having* *read* *it*, *has* *been* *compelled*, *hundreds* of *Democrats*, *as well* as *Whig* *lawyers*, *have* *been* *silenced* by it.

1. "No person."—But a slave is held as a "chattel, not as a person." Neither here, nor any where else, in the Constitution is a slave or slavery mentioned. Nor is the condition of a slave described. The description is in this clause, is the *opposite* of such a description, at every point, and is very particular.

2. "Held as service or labor."—A slave is simply held as "property"—as a chattel. Some slaves are not labor at all, and are not "held" for any purpose, but for mere convenience, as different as the case of elegant furniture.

3. Held "in one State, and in no other State."—We have already cited the witness who states that no laws can be found in many of the States, holding men in slavery. They are held in their true, lawless form, and by means other. This clause *cannot* apply to them.

4. "In claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—Of course, *any* person, *who* *owes* *any* *service* *or labor* *to another*, *under* *the* *laws* *of* *the* *State*, *whereas* *such* *service* *or labor* *is* *not* *indebted* *to* *its* *owner*.—"Chattel's never contract debts." And according to the slave code says—"A slave can make no contract." Consequently, nothing can be "due" from him.

If any "person" is claimed legally under this clause, he must be "claimed by some one to whom the service or labor is due." And the debt must be *legally proved*. It must be shown that the person whose "service and labor" is thus "claimed" has contracted a debt, which he has not discharged. But, when a slave master goes or sends into another State, for a fugitive, he claims him as a "slave" as his "*property*," and not as a "person." If he could succeed, (as he cannot) in substantiating that claim, he would only prove that nothing is, or can be "due" to him from the fugitive, and consequently that this clause of the Constitution makes no provision for his being "delivered up."

So well did Senator Mason understand this, that he objected against Mr. Dayton's proposed amendment, providing a *jury trial* for *alleged* *slaves*, in this very ground.—"A trial by jury said the Senator, necessarily carries with it a *trial of the whole right*, and a *trial of the right to service will be good into*, according to *all the forms* of the court, in determining upon *any other fact*!"—And this he was, of course, unwilling to have done, well knowing that the claim could abide no such legal scrutiny! It was in the same connection that Mr. Mason declared, (as we have before mentioned) that there was no law establishing or legalizing slavery, in any of the slave States!—A more complete and full declaration of the illegality and unconstitutionality of slavery and of the Fugitive slave bill was never made by any radical abolitionist, or ever can be, by mortal man. He knew that no claim of the kind could be legally maintained, by legal rules, in any court, and therefore he objected to any legal trial. The Senate, it seems, agreed with him, both in opinion and in purpose, and accordingly enacted that the illegal and unconstitutional practice should undergo no legal scrutiny!

Once more. We omitted to say that the phrase *held to service and labor* in this clause, is a *legal* phrase and is equivalent to the phrase "*handed to service*" in the "appportionment clause" previously considered. The two clauses, at these points, harmonize, and mutually throw light upon each other.

No body supposes that the "*persons*" mentioned in the apportionment clause, as bound to service and labor for a term of years, were "held to service and labor" as *slaves*, or otherwise, than by a *lawful* *service*. It follows that *no* *service* *in* *the* *slave* *State*, *will* *apprise* *plainly* *of* *any* *service* *or* *labor* *as* *such* *as* *is* *contrary* *to* *the* *Constitution*. The *persons* *so* *held* *or* *engaged* *in* *service*, *under* *any* *law* *made* *in* *pursuance* *of* *the* *Constitution*, *will* *be* *in* *a* *slipshod* *time*, *as* *their* *service* *months*, *an* *undesigned* *and* *unintended* *service*, *done* *in* *the* *slave* *State*, *will* *be* *delivered* *up*, *on* *claim* *of* *the* *party* *holding* *such* *service* *or* *labor*, *may* *be* *done*.

And this agrees with the records of the Convention. So far as being true that a union could have been formed with it as a clause for the *rendition* of fugitive slaves, was already existing under the articles of confederation.

theories which we were obliged to reject, as impracticable. The facts were these: we couldn't put down that carpet in that room, the other room wouldn't do, because it was too long, because it was accessible only through the parlor or kitchen, and because it was the only room which we could use for a dining-room. Fred's heart was set on that carpet—he said I should have one pretty room. We came to no conclusion, and that is why I acquired more aesthetic taste to furnish a plain material house with scanty means, than an ideal one with unbounded resources. At last I hit upon a theory which proved successful, as a basis of action. The landlord was persuaded to throw the two small rooms back of the parlor into one, and thence I could fit up for my inner sanctuary. The parlor proper, we were sent to furnish with a good looking small hand carpet, belonging to the gentleman who lived in the house the year before, some cane-bottomed chairs, and a table under the looking-glass, with a few books, and a little music basket by way of ornament. Then I hung a white curtain across one side of the room, to conceal that ugly looking blue-painted staircase, and the little closet with the two steps downward. Mending curtains at the windows relieved the room of its stiff, angular appearance, and a few pictures with moss frames, and trimmings of flowers and evergreens gave an air of freshness, so that, altogether, it looked quite neat and respectable—Fred said even pretty. And then for my dear little inner sanctuary. The carpet suited admirably, excepting that it came short at one end, but fortunately the hook-ear, freighted with our very precious, choice selection, just fitted in there. The dear writing-desk, which Fred gave me for a birthday present, almost a year ago, found a congenial resting place near one of the windows. I had a stand with a fresh vase of flowers in one corner, and put the little table near one of the windows, where Fred and I could sit after tea and watch the sun set, and have good long talks. Then, when the curtains were up, and the pictures arranged with the best light and shade, it did look very sweetly.

The dining-room was made quite respectable with a new rug carpet, cane chairs, and dining-table; while the little bedroom was converted into a china closet, for my plain stone china, and the pantry answered the purpose of a side-board. The kitchen really became quite attractive and inviting, when the brightly polished new cooking-stove, the shining kettles and pans, and snowy pine table were duly arranged to please my esthetic taste.

You remember the ideal—this was the *real* of life to me! I confidently believe, though, it gave me as much pleasure, and it certainly required more vigorous exercise of mind to plan the real than the ideal!

(Concluded next week.)

CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

God has called many a man to the ministry from the shop and the field, who had known but little of either books or men; but obedience to that call would lead the true minister to careful study and prayerful application of mind to plan for the acquiring of knowledge, to teach rightly the word of God.

It is folly, and worse than folly, for an indolent preacher to expect God to teach him that which his own zeal and industry ought to acquire; and when you hear a man stand before a congregation and avow that he preaches without preparation, relying upon God to give him matter for the occasion, be assured that man is ill fitted to expound God's word or teach the people. The work of the ministry above all other professions, requires study, careful preparation, made by the aid of all the appliances that grammar, and history, and philosophy, and language, and science can give the human mind; and the Christian ministry, as far as possible, should range the whole field, and then with the earnestness and devotion which characterized our Chief Minister, apply the truth. True learning will not beget pride or display. It is ignorance that is boastful and haughty. The ablest divines of the New Testament have been men whose souls reached forth for knowledge, and whose being has been enlarged by drinking deep from the gushing fountains of truth in science and learning and piety. In this expansion and enlargement, they were fitted to take in more of God, more of Heaven, more of man, more of the world, more of real living communion with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, to be admitted.

It is a singularly interesting fact, that the world does not possess a great number of sages. It teaches more truths than all others but each man's truths as a creation to the infinite, and as a sum total, center on a mystery.

THE CRICKET IN THE WALL.

Mark. Do you still believe in the existence of the Devil? Has he not been dislodged? What is the source of his energy? Is he still lurking about in his old haunts, or is he passing on his way in a groaning hymn? Is he singing the psalm of Satan, a savage, remorseless warrior, or leading the hosts of the dead who have gathered wisdom beyond that of the wise? Have thoughts that beset these thoughts, their peers and their equals? What tell?

But why is it that living things have a great noise?—and the hum of business is still—why man has withdrawn from the scenes and scenes of the day, and the winds have, first to their voices, that the only of the most still, low and solemn, comes abroad upon the air? Why?—Why does the darkness come down with the curtain of night, and blessed with the darkness over us? Is it that we may have a greater enjoyment of nature? The heavens may be dark, mostly cloudy, the stars may not be out to remind us, the face of the moon may be veiled, and the sound of the winds hushed, but the voice of the lark will tell us, that the beauty, joy and happiness, are still ripe in the works of God. We remember the cricket, that chirped in the corner, when we sat by our father's fireside. His voice was cheerful and it was a pleasant thing to listen to his happy song. Father, mother, brothers, sisters, were beside us, and we talked of the little warbler as a thing that we all knew well. But the corner and the cricket, and the home of our childhood, are all gone. Swept by time into the returning abyss of the past.—And those who listened with us, where are they? Father, mother, brothers, sisters, where are they?

They are scattered and parted by mountain and wave, And some are in the cold, silent womb of the grave.

Sad are the memories that the song of the cricket brings to our heart. It tells of happy days, now gone forever—of merry hours that have passed away. It brings clustering around us, the furrowed brows of the living, and pale still faces of the dead.—State Reciter.

COUNTY SPELLING MATCH.

In the last number of the *Western Reserve Chronicle* is the Report of a Trumbull county spelling match, held at Bazzetta a short time ago. The novelty of the thing was well as its practical benefits, have given circulation to the report in full, in several papers. For the present we have space but a brief notice of it. The plan originated in Yankeedown, a country fruitful in inventions and new discoveries, and was as follows: Each school district in the county should select from its scholars the best speller. The champions selected should assemble at some point within the county and there, by a trial of their respective powers in spelling, decide who was the best, and award the palm accordingly.—In the much thirty-three schools were represented. In three hours the contestants were all spelled down. According to their respective merits, they received prizes. The first prize being a large Unadmiral Fictorial Dictionary. The importance of memory, of a correct orthography, is denied by none. In no respect is our present system of education more defective than in this. The spelling class is crowded, by tame, tame, offhand and less practical studies. As a result students were versed in the natural sciences and a strong knowledge of logic and rhetoric, history and poetry, cannot write a letter or an epistle, that is not full of glaring blunders, which no amount of sociability, or study of language, or correctness of sentence can correct in them. The educated person by his friends, and the learned by his professors, in proving this state of things, is an excellent proof, and we cannot but be the conscientious of our own citizens. Let us have a Trumbull county spelling match now, and be assured to inflict the punishment of our worthy right.

—Yankee Dodo.

It is a singularly interesting fact, that the world does not possess a great number of sages. It teaches more truths than all others but each man's truths as a creation to the infinite, and as a sum total, center on a mystery.

OUR OWN FAULTS.

Let us not be too hasty in judging others. We are not perfect, and our own, let us say, in our 1850 election, was not the most perfect, nor probably any other, but they shall we be more prone to find that the fault lies at the faults of others, and of others, the former, is indeed in this way, by the fault of us, to sustain us in our wrongs through the signs of God's displeasure. Let us, then, perceive that we are not perfect, and, very easily, we can know in himself, when he is good, that he can, and very easily, be found to be otherwise. He who condemns others, let him condemn his own sins, and look at his failures, whilst he is an extreme example of the excesses and sins of others, as printed in many ways. Are we not, will tell you. When houses stand so much on one half built excellently, it is raised to complete the same, when he sees that he himself has built it, and is considered honest and upright. If we act thus, if we do not consider ourselves, we shall be able to obtain the good things which we are promised through the grace and love of our kindred one, Lord Jesus Christ.—St. Chrysostom.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER ON THE FORD, 1850. A fact was revealed in Court at New Madrid, Missouri, in which is not a little startling in a scientific point of view, as tending to show that the Mississippi of to-day is not the same it was half a century ago. One of the most interesting facts of New Madrid stated on oath that he has known the river more than fifty years, and that when he first saw it, it was much shallower than now—indeed he had often heard of it as being shallow. Several other old residents of New Madrid confirmed this statement, and declare that the river at that point, now more than a mile wide, was fordable half a century ago.—*Confidential W.*

The river, at a given point, at New Madrid, perhaps may have been more shallow, than now, half a century ago, without impeding the Mississippi's to dig the more water than it formerly did. Rivers and creeks have their shallowness places, owing, in some instances, to their spreading out, wide, in that particular place, and, in other instances, from the fact that an accumulation of sand or gravel at bottom, throws up a high bed which constitutes a bar to the water to pass over, at a particular point, while it is deeper above and below that point. Great freshets do sweep away such bars, cut deeper channels, or make stream deep and narrow where it was shallow and broad before. It would be rather "shallow" for scientific men to conclude that the Mississippi has been doubled within last fifty years, without other data than is furnished above.—*Princeton.*

A WOMAN'S ANSWER.—A writer illustrating the fact that some errors are lifted into importance by efforts to fit them, when they need to be treated with contempt, ridicules the idea that all the blunders made by the heroic club of certain logicians are not half so offensive as the error of the ear of a celebrated atheist by the hand of a heretic. After having in vain preached to a crew of Latinists, at Madrid, say error, ladies, I did not imagine that hours would sit up with grace. I alone should have the honor of not being a heretic.

"You are not alone sir," answered the misses of Madrid, "my house is not the only one near the house of your club; these other ladies have the good taste to be honest."

It is in vain to try to please a wife. Let her be with her friends, if what she does, she will, be not to turn her back on a half the world.

THE SOUTHERN LADY.

A weekly Family Paper, devoted to Domestic Subjects, and the Slave, large format, published at M. 21 LANE, 7th Street, St. Louis, Missouri,—Send 15c.

AMERICAN SLAVERY.—See *AMERICAN SLAVERY*.

—See *AMERICAN SLAVERY*.